1		
1	Kathy L. Osborn (<i>pro hac vice</i>) Ryan M. Hurley (<i>pro hac vice</i>)	
2	Faegre Baker Daniels LLP 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700	
3	Indianapolis, IN 46204 Telephone: (317) 237-0300	
4	Facsimile: (317) 237-1000 kathy.osborn@FaegreBD.com	
5	ryan.hurley@FaegreBD.com	
6	Attorneys for Defendants Thomson SA and Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.	
7	and Inomson Consumer Liceironics, Inc.	
8	Guido Saveri (22349) R. Alexander Saveri (173102)	
9	Geoffrey C. Rushing (126910) Travis L. Manfredi (281779)	
10	SAVERI & SAVERI, INC. 706 Sansome Street	
11	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 217-6810	
12	Facsimile: (415) 217-6813	
13	Interim Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs	
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
15	NORTHERN DISTR	ICT OF CALIFORNIA SCO DIVISION
16		
16		
17	IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)	
	IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT) ANTITRUST LITIGATION	
17		Case No. 07-5944 SC
17 18		MDL No. 1917
17 18 19 20 21	ANTITRUST LITIGATION	
17 18 19	ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Document Relates to: Crago d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., et al. v.	MDL No. 1917 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PRESERVATION OF ARGUMENTS FOR APPEAL
17 18 19 20 21 22	ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Document Relates to: Crago d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., et al. v.	MDL No. 1917 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PRESERVATION
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Document Relates to: Crago d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., et al. v.	MDL No. 1917 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PRESERVATION OF ARGUMENTS FOR APPEAL
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Document Relates to: Crago d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., et al. v.	MDL No. 1917 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PRESERVATION OF ARGUMENTS FOR APPEAL
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Document Relates to: Crago d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., et al. v.	MDL No. 1917 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PRESERVATION OF ARGUMENTS FOR APPEAL
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	ANTITRUST LITIGATION This Document Relates to: Crago d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc., et al. v.	MDL No. 1917 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PRESERVATION OF ARGUMENTS FOR APPEAL

1	Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 6-2 and 7-12, Crago, d/b/a Dash Computers, Inc.; Arch
2	Electronics, Inc.; Meijer, Inc.; Meijer Distribution, Inc.; Nathan Muchnick, Inc.; Princeton
3	Display Technologies, Inc.; Radio & TV Equipment, Inc.; Studio Spectrum, Inc.; and Wettstein
4	and Sons, Inc., d/b/a Wettsteins's (collectively the "Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs" or "DPPs"), and
5	Defendants Thomson S.A. (n.k.a. Technicolor S.A.) and Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.
6	(n.k.a. Technicolor USA, Inc.) (collectively, the "Thomson Defendants") have conferred by and
7	through their counsel and, subject to the Court's approval, HEREBY STIPULATE AS
8	FOLLOWS:
9	WHEREAS, there is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District
10	of California a multidistrict consolidated proceeding comprised of actions brought on behalf of
11	purported purchasers of cathode ray tubes ("CRT") and CRT products, captioned as In re
12	Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 3:07-cv-05944 SC (MDL No. 1917) (the
13	"MDL Proceedings");
14	WHEREAS, the DPPs have filed a Class Action Complaint, which is now pending in this
15	MDL, naming the Thomson Defendants as Defendants (the "DPP Complaint");
16	WHEREAS, the DPPs have previously filed a substantially similar Consolidated
17	Amended Complaint alleging the same conduct and naming various other entities as Defendants;
18	WHEREAS, certain other plaintiffs (the "Direct Action Plaintiffs" or "DAPs") have filed
19	substantially similar Complaints or Amended Complaints alleging the same conduct and naming
20	the Thomson Defendants as Defendants;
21	WHEREAS, the DAPs have also filed substantially similar Complaints or Amended
22	Complaints alleging the same conduct and naming various other entities as Defendants;
23	WHEREAS, on May 18, 2009 and June 17, 2009, Defendants other than the Thomson
24	Defendants filed several Motions to Dismiss the DPPs' Consolidated Amended Complaint (Dkt.
25	463, 464, 466, 467, 474, 476, 479, 482, 485, 491, 492);

27 28

26

Defendants' Motions to Dismiss the DPPs' Consolidated Amended Complaint (Dkt. 665);

WHEREAS, on March 30, 2010, the Court issued an Order ruling on the other

1	WHEREAS, on December 12, 2011, Defendants other than the Thomson Defendants
2	filed a Joint Motion for Summary Judgment with respect to the DPPs' Consolidated Amended
3	Complaint (Dkt. 1013);
4	WHEREAS, on November 29, 2012, the Court issued an Order ruling on the other
5	Defendants' Joint Motion for Summary Judgment with respect to the DPPs' Consolidated
6	Amended Complaint (Dkt. 1470);
7	WHEREAS, on August 17, 2012, Defendants other than the Thomson Defendants filed
8	Motions to Dismiss and for Judgment on the Pleadings with respect to certain DAPs (Dkt. 1316,
9	1317, 1319);
10	WHEREAS, on August 21, 2013, the Court issued an Order ruling on the other
11	Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and for Judgment on the Pleadings (Dkt. 1856);
12	WHEREAS, on November 25, 2013, January 27, 2014, and February 7, 2014, Thomson
13	SA filed Motions to Dismiss and/or Strike with Prejudice the DAPs' Complaints or Amended
14	Complaints (Dkt. 2235, 2355, 2373);
15	WHEREAS, on November 25, 2013, January 16, 2014, and January 27, 2014, Thomson
16	Consumer filed Motions to Dismiss and/or Strike with Prejudice the DAPs' Complaints or
17	Amended Complaints (Dkt. 2236, 2329, 2353);
18	WHEREAS, on March 13, 2014, the Court issued an Order ruling on the Thomson
19	Defendants' Motions to Dismiss and/or Strike with Prejudice the DAPs' Complaints of Amended
20	Complaints (Dkt. 2440);
21	WHEREAS, Thomson Consumer's deadline to answer or otherwise respond to the DPPs'
22	Complaint is May 30, 2014;
23	WHEREAS, the DPPs have requested that Thomson SA waive service of their
24	Complaint;
25	WHEREAS, the DPPs and the Thomson Defendants wish to conserve judicial resources
26	and avoid re-litigating issues previously decided by this Court while preserving any and all
27	appeal rights of the DPPs and the Thomson Defendants;

1 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED between counsel 2 as follows: 3 1. All motions decided in the MDL to date are deemed to have been raised by the 4 Thomson Defendants against the DPP Complaint, and the arguments raised in any such motions 5 are preserved for appellate purposes as if they had been made by the Thomson Defendants against the DPP Complaint. 6 7 2. Thomson SA waives service of the DPP Complaint in accordance with Rule 4(d) Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. 8 9 The deadline for the Thomson Defendants to answer or otherwise respond to the DPP Complaint shall be on or before July 30, 2014. 10 11 12 Dated: May 30, 2014 FAEGRE BAKER DANIELS LLP 13 14 By: /s/ Kathy L. Osborn Kathy L. Osborn (pro hac vice) 15 Ryan M. Hurley (pro hac vice) Faegre Baker Daniels LLP 16 300 N. Meridian Street, Suite 2700 Indianapolis, IN 46204 17 Telephone: (317) 237-0300 Facsimile: (317) 237-1000 18 kathy.osborn@FaegreBD.com ryan.hurley@FaegreBD.com 19 Jeffrey S. Roberts (*pro hac vice*) 20 Faegre Baker Daniels LLP 3200 Wells Fargo Center 21 1700 Lincoln Street Denver, CO 80203 22 Telephone: (303) 607-3500 Facsimile: (303) 607-3600 23 jeff.roberts@FaegreBD.com 24 Calvin L. Litsey (SBN 289659) Faegre Baker Daniels LLP 25 1950 University Avenue, Suite 450 East Palo Alto, CA 94303-2279 26 Telephone: (650) 324-6700 Facsimile: (650) 324-6701 27 calvin.litsey@FaegreBD.com 28

Case 3:07-cv-05944-JST Document 2616 Filed 06/12/14 Page 5 of 5

1	Stephen M. Judge (pro hac vice)	
2	Faegre Baker Daniels LLP	
3	202 S. Michigan Street, Suite 1400 South Bend, IN 46601	
4	Telephone: (574) 234-4149 Facsimile: (574) 239-1900	
5	steve.judge@FaegreBD.com	
6	Attorneys for Defendants Thomson SA and Thomson Consumer Electronics, Inc.	
7		
8	Dated: May 30, 2014 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.	
9	By: /s/ Guido Saveri	
10	Guido Saveri (22349) R. Alexander Saveri (173102)	
11	Geoffrey C. Rushing (126910) Travis L. Manfredi (281779)	
12	SAVERI & SAVERI, INC. 706 Sansome Street	
13	San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: (415) 217-6810	
14	Facsimile: (415) 217-6813	
15	Interim Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs	
16		
17	PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.	
18		
19	Dated: June 12, 2014	
20	Hon. Samuel Conti United States District Judge	
21		
22	Pursuant to Local Rule 5-1(i), the filer attests that the concurrence in the filing of this	
23	document has been obtained from each of the above signatories.	
24		
25	Dated: May 30, 2014 By: /s/ Kathy L. Osborn	
26		
27		
28		
	STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER REGARDING PRESERVATION OF ARGUMENTS FOR APPEAL	